

Claims 13 through 20 and 22 through 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0227540 A1 to Monroe ("Monroe publication"). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Monroe publication in view of U.S. Patent No. US 7,058,409 B2 to Hänninen, et al. ("Hänninen, et al. patent"). Claims 1 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hänninen, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. US 6,993,354 B2 to Momosaki, et al. ("Momosaki, et al. patent").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with the at least one remote device by associating the collected data with the incident. Support for the above added recitation is found at page 15, lines 9 through 14, of the specification, and exemplary explanation are provided at page 17, line 1, through page 18, line 11, of the specification.

In contrast, the Monroe publication, the Hänninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest associating collected data with an incident in order to coordinate data collection. The Hänninen, et al. patent describes collecting data and forwarding the data to the nearest base station, but the Hänninen, et al. patent does not describe or suggest coordinating the collection of data by associating the collected data with the incident. In fact, the Hänninen, et al. patent is not concerned with associating collected data, because the source of the collected data, such as digital camera 110, is already associated (by the user of both devices) with the mobile terminal 120. The mobile terminal 120 of the Hänninen, et al. patent would not have a need to associate collected data, since the digital camera 110 collects audio/video

information for the mobile terminal. Claim 1, on the other hand, states that the wireless communication device scans for remote devices and does not necessarily know the source of its collected data, thus necessitating association of the collected data with the subject incident. Likewise, the Momosaki, et al. patent and the Monroe publication do not describe or suggest any type of coordination of data collection between devices. Therefore, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with one or more remote devices, let alone associating the collected data with the incident, as required by claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 6 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1 as amended. Therefore, claims 2 through 6 distinguish patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 1.

Claim 7 as amended provides, *inter alia*, recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote device. Support for the above added recitation is provided at page 18, line 12, through page 20, line 7, of the specification.

In contrast, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest a device that records incident data in response to receiving a signal or information from a remote device. The Hanninen, et al. patent describes a mobile

terminal 120 that records and transmits events, collected by itself or an external digital camera 110, when a crime occurs. The Hanninen, et al. patent suggests that the user of the mobile terminal 120, such as the victim, initiates recordation and transmission of data, and it does not describe or suggest that the recording of data occurs in response to a signal or information received from a remote device. Likewise, the Momosaki, et al. patent and the Monroe publication do not describe or suggest any type of data recordation in response to a signal or information received from a remote device. Therefore, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote device, as required by claim 7 as amended. Claim 7 distinguishes patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references.

Claims 8 through 12 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 7 as amended. Therefore, claims 8 through 12 distinguish patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 7.

Claim 13 provides, *inter alia*, comparing the incident information to previously received information to identify one or more portions of the previously received information that relates to the incident information, and correlating the incident information with the one or more portions of the previously received information that relates to the incident information.

On the other hand, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest comparing or correlating incident information with previously received information. The Monroe publication describes an operation for archiving data without any reference to any type of comparison or correlation of this stored data. Likewise, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest any type of comparison or correlation of incident information with previously received information. Therefore, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest comparing the incident information to previously received information to identify one or more portions of the previously received information that relates to the incident information, and correlating the incident information with the one or more portions of the previously received information that relates to the incident information, as required by claim 13. Claim 13 distinguishes patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references.

Claims 14 through 16 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 13. Therefore, claims 14 through 16 distinguish patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 13.

Claim 17 provides, *inter alia*, two wireless communication devices and a central authority, in which one device (i.e., the second wireless communication device) collects data relating to the incident event and transmits data collected by the both devices (the first and second wireless communication devices) to the central authority. After data collected from both

devices are coordinated, the second communication device transmits the coordinated data to the central authority.

In rejecting claim 17, the above Office Action references FIG. 21A and paragraph [0021] of the Monroe publication. As stated at lines 13 through 17 of the Monroe publication, " ... [t]his may activate cameras focused on the location of the telephone for transmitting live video data to the manned station as well as the system server for management and for archiving both the audio and video data." Thus, the Monroe publication describes a system in which audio and video data are fed to multiple components, and does not describe any type of component that transmits data coordinated by two different devices to a central authority. Likewise, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest any type of component that transmits data coordinated by two different devices to a central authority. Therefore, the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest two wireless communication devices and a central authority, in which one device collects data relating to the incident event and transmits data collected by the both devices to the central authority, as required by claim 17. Claim 17 distinguishes patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references.

Claims 18 through 24 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 17. Therefore, claims 18 through 24 distinguish patentably from the Monroe publication, the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 24 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brown, Daniel P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

/HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 10/03/06
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350